

H.R. 546, H.R. 2457 and H.R. 2715

LEGISLATIVE HEARING

BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, RECREATION,
AND PUBLIC LANDS

OF THE
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

Tuesday, July 22, 2003

Serial No. 108-44

Printed for the use of the Committee on Resources



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/house>
or
Committee address: <http://resourcescommittee.house.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

88-468 PS

WASHINGTON : 2003

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

RICHARD W. POMBO, California, *Chairman*
NICK J. RAHALL II, West Virginia, *Ranking Democrat Member*

Don Young, Alaska	Dale E. Kildee, Michigan
W.J. "Billy" Tauzin, Louisiana	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, American Samoa
Jim Saxton, New Jersey	Neil Abercrombie, Hawaii
Elton Gallegly, California	Solomon P. Ortiz, Texas
John J. Duncan, Jr., Tennessee	Frank Pallone, Jr., New Jersey
Wayne T. Gilchrest, Maryland	Calvin M. Dooley, California
Ken Calvert, California	Donna M. Christensen, Virgin Islands
Scott McInnis, Colorado	Ron Kind, Wisconsin
Barbara Cubin, Wyoming	Jay Inslee, Washington
George Radanovich, California	Grace F. Napolitano, California
Walter B. Jones, Jr., North Carolina	Tom Udall, New Mexico
Chris Cannon, Utah	Mark Udall, Colorado
John E. Peterson, Pennsylvania	Anibal Acevedo-Vilá, Puerto Rico
Jim Gibbons, Nevada,	Brad Carson, Oklahoma
<i>Vice Chairman</i>	Raúl M. Grijalva, Arizona
Mark E. Souder, Indiana	Dennis A. Cardoza, California
Greg Walden, Oregon	Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Guam
Thomas G. Tancredo, Colorado	George Miller, California
J.D. Hayworth, Arizona	Edward J. Markey, Massachusetts
Tom Osborne, Nebraska	Rubén Hinojosa, Texas
Jeff Flake, Arizona	Ciro D. Rodriguez, Texas
Dennis R. Rehberg, Montana	Joe Baca, California
Rick Renzi, Arizona	Betty McCollum, Minnesota
Tom Cole, Oklahoma	
Stevan Pearce, New Mexico	
Rob Bishop, Utah	
Devin Nunes, California	
Randy Neugebauer, Texas	

Steven J. Ding, *Chief of Staff*
Lisa Pittman, *Chief Counsel*
James H. Zoia, *Democrat Staff Director*
Jeffrey P. Petrich, *Democrat Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, RECREATION,
AND PUBLIC LANDS

GEORGE P. RADANOVICH, California, *Chairman*

DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN, Virgin Islands, *Ranking Democrat Member*

Elton Gallegly, California	Dale E. Kildee, Michigan
John J. Duncan, Jr., Tennessee	Ron Kind, Wisconsin
Wayne T. Gilchrest, Maryland	Tom Udall, New Mexico
Barbara Cubin, Wyoming	Mark Udall, Colorado
Walter B. Jones, Jr., North Carolina	Aníbal Acevedo-Vilá, Puerto Rico
Chris Cannon, Utah	Raúl M. Grijalva, Arizona
John E. Peterson, Pennsylvania	Dennis A. Cardoza, California
Jim Gibbons, Nevada	Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Guam
Mark E. Souder, Indiana	Nick J. Rahall II, West Virginia, <i>ex officio</i>
Rob Bishop, Utah	
Richard W. Pombo, California, <i>ex officio</i>	

C O N T E N T S

Hearing held on July 22, 2003	Page 1
Statement of Members:	
Case, Hon. Ed, a Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii	3
Prepared statement on H.R. 546	4
Christensen, Hon. Donna M., a Delegate in Congress from the Virgin Islands, Prepared statement on H.R. 546, H.R. 2457 and H.R. 2715	6
Mica, Hon. John, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida .	5
Radanovich, Hon. George P., a Representative in Congress from the State of California	1
Prepared statement on H.R. 546, H.R. 2457 and H.R. 2715	2
Statement of Witnesses:	
Adams, Dr. William R., Ph.D., Vice President, Colonial St. Augustine Preservation Foundation, Inc., St. Augustine, Florida	7
Prepared statement on H.R. 2457	9
Jarvis, Jon, Regional Director, Pacific West Region, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Oakland, California,	10
Prepared statement on H.R. 546	10
Prepared statement on H.R. 2457	12
Prepared statement on H.R. 2715	14

**LEGISLATIVE HEARING ON H.R. 546, TO
REVISE THE BOUNDARY OF THE KALOKO-
HONOKOHAU NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK
IN THE STATE OF HAWAII, AND FOR OTHER
PURPOSES; H.R. 2457, TO AUTHORIZE
FUNDS FOR AN EDUCATIONAL CENTER FOR
THE CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL
MONUMENT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES;
AND H.R. 2715, TO PROVIDE FOR
NECESSARY IMPROVEMENTS TO FACILITIES
AT YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK, AND FOR
OTHER PURPOSES.**

**Tuesday, July 22, 2003
U.S. House of Representatives
Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands
Committee on Resources
Washington, DC**

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 2:00 p.m., in room 1334, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. George Radanovich [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Radanovich, Kildee, and Grijalva.

**STATEMENT OF THE HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH, A
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA**

Mr. RADANOVICH. Good afternoon. The Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands is called to order. This is a hearing on H.R. 546, H.R. 2457 and H.R. 2715.

Our first bill, H.R. 546, introduced by Congressman Ed Case of Hawaii, would revise the boundary of the Kaloko-Honokohau National Historic Park in the State of Hawaii.

Our second bill, H.R. 2457, introduced by Congressman John Mica of Florida, would authorize funds for an educational center for the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument.

Our last bill, H.R. 2715, which I introduced, provides necessary improvements for the facilities at Yosemite National Park.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Specifically, my bill, among other things, would direct the Secretary of Interior to restore the campsites at Upper and Lower River campgrounds, construct the maximum number of parking spaces in and around Camp 6 and prohibit the implementation of an out-of-Valley shuttle using remote parking facilities.

While I introduced H.R. 2715 for a number of reasons, my primary reason is to have the Service restore the number of campsites that existed in Yosemite Valley prior to the 1997 Merced River flood. At the Subcommittee's April 22 field hearing, the Service told me that they are prohibited from administratively amending the December, 2000, Yosemite Valley plan to adjust the campground numbers. I would like to fix this problem legislatively.

In addition, my bill would direct the Secretary to remove the LeConte Memorial from the park. I believe the LeConte Memorial Lodge, which is operated by the Sierra Club, is inconsistent with the Club's stated opposition to restoring Upper and Lower River campgrounds and to minimize the human footprint in the Valley. Private use permits such as that permit for the LeConte Memorial Lodge are not as important as public use as park resources such as low-impact camping. If the Sierra Club is serious about reducing the human impact in Yosemite Valley, the Lodge should be removed and that portion of the Valley restored to its natural condition. Any other position is nothing short of hypocritical.

Mrs. Christensen, I understand will not be here, I would ask unanimous consent that Mr. Case and Mr. Mica be permitted to sit on the dais following these statements. Without any objection—I don't see any objection here, so ordered.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Radanovich follows:]

Statement of The Honorable George Radanovich, Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands, on H.R. 546, H.R. 2457, and H.R. 2715

Good afternoon. The hearing will come to order

This afternoon, the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands will receive testimony on three bills—H.R. 546, H.R. 2457 and H.R. 2715. Our first bill, H.R. 546, introduced by Congressman Ed Case of Hawaii, revises the boundary of the Kaloko Historical Park in the State of Hawaii.

Our second bill, H.R. 2457, introduced by Congressman John Mica of Florida, would authorize funds for an educational center for the Castillo (Cos-tee-yo) de San Marcos National Monument.

Our last bill, H.R. 2715, which I introduced, would provide for necessary improvements to facilities at Yosemite National Park. Specifically, my bill would, among other things, direct the Secretary of the Interior to restore the camp sites at the Upper and Lower River campgrounds, construct the maximum number of parking spaces in and around Camp 6, and prohibit the implementation of an out-of-valley shuttle system using remote parking facilities. While I introduced H.R. 2715 for a number of reasons, my primary reason is to have the Service restore the number of campsites that existed in Yosemite Valley prior to the 1997 Merced River Flood. At the Subcommittee's April 22 field hearing, the Service told me that they are prohibited from administratively amending their December 2000 Yosemite Valley Plan to adjust the campground numbers. I would like to fix this problem legislatively.

In addition, my bill would direct the Secretary to remove the LeConte Memorial from the Park. I believe the LeConte Memorial Lodge, which is operated by the Sierra Club, is inconsistent with the Club's stated opposition to restoring Upper and Lower River Campgrounds, and to minimizing the human footprint in the Valley. Certainly private use permits, such as the permit for the LeConte Memorial Lodge, are not as important as public uses of park resources, such as low impact camping. If the Sierra Club is serious about reducing human impact in the Valley, the Lodge should be removed and that portion of the Valley restored to its natural condition. Any other position is nothing short of hypocritical.

Before turning the time over to Mrs. Christensen, I would ask unanimous consent that Mr. Case and Mr. Mica be permitted to sit on the dais following their statements. Without objection, so ordered.

I now turn to the Ranking Member, Mrs. Christensen for any opening statement she may have.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I will now then go ahead and turn to our first panel of witnesses; and I want to welcome the Honorable Ed Case, Representative from Hawaii, to the Committee.

Mr. Case, welcome. You are here to speak on your bill, H.R. 546. I apologize for maybe butchering the names that were included in there, and maybe you can set me straight on the proper pronunciation.

**STATEMENT OF THE HON. ED CASE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF HAWAII**

Mr. CASE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I would be happy to give private lessons later on. First of all, it is "Kaloko-Honokohau."

I thank you very much for considering H.R. 546, which is to authorize expansion of the Kaloko-Honokohau National Historic Park by two acres. You have my written testimony, Mr. Chair; and I would ask the Committee's consent to simply insert that into the record, if that is permissible.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Hearing no objection, so ordered.

Mr. CASE. I have reviewed the supportive written testimony of the National Park Service, and am very much supportive in endorsing that.

So what I would like to do with my time, Mr. Chair, is to give you the big picture of where this bill fits into efforts to protect the incredibly valuable and unique natural, scenic, recreational and historic resources of my Hawaii. And these are rich resources indeed. They range everywhere in incredible numbers, in fact, from the highest numbers in our country of endangered plants and species; to incredibly unique national and scenic resources from active volcanoes to fantastic coastlines and seashores, and then finally the historic physical remains of a rich, prosperous and advanced indigenous culture well over a thousand years old. All of these are not only State but national and international treasures, and all of them are endangered or threatened for one reason or another.

On the West Coast of the Island of Hawaii, where Kaloko-Honokohau is located, the major threat is development: rapid development, urban development, not particularly smart growth on the Kona Coast. We have seen most of the rapid and spread-out growth in all of Hawaii over the past decade. This Committee and this Congress together with the National Park Service have recognized all of this over a period of decades through many actions throughout Hawaii for which I am most grateful.

On the Big Island of Hawaii alone, on the West Coast, the Kona Coast, some of those efforts have been: the designation of Puuhonua o Honaunau National Historic Park, the so-called City of Refuge, a deeply significant site of ancient Hawaiian culture; Puukohola Heiau National Historic Site, which is the great war temple of Kamehameha I; the Ala Kahakai National Historic Trail, which is the ancient road, the ancient way around the entire Island

of Hawaii; and then, finally, just a few weeks ago, the huge expansion of really the crown jewel, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, with the addition of Kahuku Ranch.

Now Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park is an integral part of this overall effort to protect the natural, scenic and cultural resources of the Island of Hawaii. It really has everything that we are talking about here. It has incredibly significant ancient ruins, ranging from an ancient fish pond to house sites. It has endangered plants. It has a major portion of the Ala Kahakai ancient trail that runs through it. So this site is an incredibly valuable component of our overall national, international and State efforts to protect the scenic and natural resources of my State.

This site has done very well but lacks one thing, and that is adequate administration and parking facilities. The particular bill in front of this Committee would take a 2.1 acre site immediately adjacent to the current park with a building that is already in existence on it and really turn that into parking and administration for the site. It is a fantastic siting and fantastic addition to the park. I was just there about a week-and-a-half ago and did my own site inspection. I overflowed the park, and it is really everything that we are expecting it to be.

The National Park Service is supportive not only because it needs these facilities at this particular park, but because what it hopes to do in addition is to run its administrative efforts for all of West Hawaii out of this particular site, ranging from Puukohola, which is up to the north, and on down to Puuhonua o Honaunau in the south. So this is really a very important effort that I urge this Committee's support for and appreciate this Committee's anticipated support.

I would be happy to answer any questions; and I look forward, once we get this one over with, to a number of other efforts that I would love to bring to the Committee's attention having to do with other sites in Hawaii. As always, I offer the benefit of an in-depth site visit should the Committee deem it appropriate. We can certainly show you what we are all about. Thank you very much.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you very much, Mr. Case. Appreciate your testimony.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Case follows:]

Statement of The Honorable Ed Case, a Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii, on H.R. 546

Chairman Radanovich, Ranking Member Christensen, and Members of the Subcommittee:

Aloha! Thank you for giving me the opportunity today to testify in support of my bill to authorize expansion of the Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park, located on the Kona Coast of the Island of Hawaii. This bill is identical to Senator Daniel Akaka's bill S. 254, which passed the Senate on March 4, 2003, and was referred to this Subcommittee.

H.R. 546 and S. 254 authorize expansion of the park boundaries to allow the National Park Service to purchase a 2.14-acre parcel with an existing building to serve as a park headquarters. The park has been without a permanent headquarters since its establishment in 1978, and is now renting space some distance from the park.

Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park was created for the national preservation, protection and interpretation of traditional native Hawaiian activities and culture. This 1,160-acre park is remarkable not only for its cultural and historical attributes, but as an incredibly beautiful, unspoiled natural treasure. The park is the site of an ancient Hawaiian settlement, which encompasses portions of four different ahupua'a, or traditional sea-to-mountain land divisions. Its resources include

ancient fishponds, kahua (house site platforms), ki'i pohaku (petroglyphs), a holua (stone slide), and heiau (religious sites). The park is of tremendous significance to the people of Hawaii, and especially to indigenous Native Hawaiians.

The National Park Service is currently renting space for its headquarters at a cost of \$150,000 a year. The current headquarters only has parking for three to four visitors at a time, which is woefully inadequate to accommodate the growing number of visitors to the park. Visitors increased from 54,000 in 2001 to 70,000 in 2002. The proposed acquisition has plenty of parking for visitors and park vehicles. And the existing building has more than adequate space for the park's administrative needs and interpretive mission. The already-developed parcel has the additional benefit of being right next to the park; therefore, the fragile resources within the current park boundaries will not be adversely affected.

I strongly encourage the Subcommittee members to come to my birthplace, the Big Island of Hawaii, to visit this remarkable park, and I thank you for considering this legislation.

Mr. RADANOVICH. As you know, we have had a vote call here; and I think what we are going to try to do is hear from our first panel, take a break and vote, and then come back and hear the testimony from panel 2.

So joining us now is the Honorable John Mica, who is representing the Seventh District of Florida, here to speak on H.R. 2457.

John, welcome to the Committee; and as soon as you are done, we will all go vote.

**STATEMENT OF THE HON. JOHN MICA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA**

Mr. MICA. I will try to be brief so we don't miss the vote.

I appreciate your hearing my legislation, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. H.R. 2457 is legislation that would authorize basically Federal participation in what I consider a very unique partnership to one of our national treasures, Castillo de San Marcos.

I think some of you may be familiar with this site, which is now run by the National Park Service. You can see the Castillo here and on existing Federal park property the Department of Interior and National Park Service, and it served us well for some 400 years. It is probably the most historic fort that we have in the United States, certainly one of the most complete and earliest documented national treasures, as I said.

It is very difficult to reconfigure that type of facility to today's demand on tourism, and we have millions of tourists for a small community of some 12,000 who visit St. Augustine, who visit there. It is also difficult to keep up with things like our requirements for citizens with disability. It is difficult to also put some of the national treasures, archival records and other things that are so important to a fully educational experience on display, given the parameters of a castle and fortress of this age.

And the States recognize this. The City of St. Augustine has recognized this. A unique partnership, Colonial St. Augustine Preservation Foundation, a private sector group has come together; and, right now, across the street, in some of the areas—and you will have to excuse me, I am a bit color blind. But the blue area that is being pointed out here, the State of Florida owns; and the purple area, the City of St. Augustine owns; and then we have some commercial areas, too, that—what color is that—the yellow ones that

we are looking to acquire. This would—this is also on a very historic street, area of the colonial St. Augustine area. But what we are looking at doing is creating a visitor center and taking out some of the tacky development and complete the experience for the visitor and put some basic accommodations and historical display that can only be accommodated by a new structure. So that is the plan.

I want to stress again it is a unique approach. It would have a partnership, again, the private sector, the State of Florida, the City of St. Augustine joining together and eventually have this turned over to the National Park Service.

We believe we can also, as part of that plan, eliminate any of the future costs. This is not a new idea, Mr. Chairman. Since 1977, it has been part of a proposed master plan but never all of these things come together to allow us to develop this. So we would encourage your authorization.

We are looking at about half of the \$8.2 million project to be funded by the Federal Government; about \$4 million, the balance, to be contributed by State, City and the private foundation.

You will hear in a few minutes after this vote from Dr. Bill Adams, who is Vice President of the Foundation; and he will explain their unique role and also moving this project forward at I think very little cost to the taxpayers but great benefit to the future.

So, with that, I urge your support. I would like to see this authorized sooner rather than later and be glad to answer questions maybe when we come back.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thanks, John. I appreciate that as well as testimony from you, Mr. Case. Thank you for coming before the Subcommittee. If you will join us after the vote, we will have the second panel and address both of your bills.

We are in recess to go vote.

[Recess.]

Mr. RADANOVICH. The Committee is back in session.

We are going to introduce our second panel, but before we do that, I want to recognize Mr. Kildee.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to submit the statement of the Ranking Member, Donna Christensen, into the record.

Mr. RADANOVICH. There being no objection, so ordered. Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of Mrs. Christensen follows:]

**Statement of The Honorable Donna Christensen, a Delegate in Congress
from the Virgin Islands, on H.R. 546, H.R. 2457 and H.R. 2715**

Mr. Chairman, today the Subcommittee is meeting to receive testimony on three unrelated bills.

Our first bill, H.R. 546, sponsored by our colleague Ed Case, would expand the boundary of the "KA-lo-ko hon-o-ko-HOW" National Historical Park on the western shore of the Island of Hawaii.

It is our understanding that the National Park Service currently rents space in a building near the Park for use as a visitor's center and administrative offices. Apparently, there is a much larger space for sale nearby.

This legislation will alter the boundary of the Park to include this building so that the Park Service might acquire the new space for Park use. We look forward to hearing about the Park and about the need for this expansion and acquisition.

Our second measure is H.R. 2457, sponsored by Representative Mica. Like the Park in Hawaii, the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in Florida has no visitor's center. To remedy this, H.R. 2457 would authorize a total of \$4 million in grants to the City of St. Augustine, Florida and the Colonial St. Augustine Preservation Foundation for the design and construction of a visitor's center for the Monument. The legislation would require that the City and the Foundation provide a 50 percent match for these grants and enter into a cooperative agreement with the National Park Service.

This approach to providing visitor facilities for a unit of the National Park System is unusual and raises several concerns. In particular, it is our understanding that the National Park Service is in the process of preparing a new general management plan for the Monument and authorization of a new visitor's facility may be premature if it takes place before completion of the new plan. We look forward to input on this issue from our witnesses.

Our last bill, H.R. 2715, which you introduced just last week, would make significant changes to the approved plans for the preservation and use of Yosemite National Park.

Mr. Chairman I certainly appreciated having the opportunity this Spring to travel to Yosemite National Park and participate with you in the Subcommittee's field hearing in Yosemite Valley.

The Yosemite Valley Plan is a far-reaching document that was developed over a long period of time with considerable public input. As NPS Director Mainella noted, public input has not ended with completion of the plan. Our field hearing showed there is significant ongoing local and national interest in the preservation and use of Yosemite National Park.

Against that backdrop it should come as no surprise that the introduction of H.R. 2715 has generated significant interest and concern with the legislation from numerous individuals and organizations. Many of the provisions of the bill run directly counter to the Yosemite Valley Plan. As such, the Subcommittee will need to carefully consider the changes being proposed and their impact on the preservation and use of Yosemite National Park.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the attendance of our witnesses and colleagues who are present with us and look forward to learning more about the matters we are considering today.

Mr. RADANOVICH. With that I would like to introduce Mr. Jon Jarvis, who is the Regional Director of the Pacific West Region of the National Park Service, here to speak on all three bills, actually, H.R. 546, 2457 and 2715; and then Dr. William R. Adams, who is the Vice President of Colonial St. Augustine, Florida, here to speak on H.R. 2457. Mr. Adams, welcome.

Each of you have about 5 minutes, and we will go through both of the testimonies. Mr. Mica, you are more than welcome to join us on the dais.

Mr. MICA. I will stay down here with my folks. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I did introduce Mr. Adams, and he is ready to begin his testimony. Mr. Adams, welcome.

Again, if you follow the 5-minute timers, limit it to 5 minutes, we would appreciate it. Thank you very much.

**STATEMENT OF WILLIAM R. ADAMS, PH.D., VICE PRESIDENT,
COLONIAL ST. AUGUSTINE PRESERVATION FOUNDATION,
ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA (H.R. 2457)**

Mr. ADAMS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am appearing before the Subcommittee on behalf of the Colonial St. Augustine Preservation Foundation, a not-for-profit organization whose purpose is to engage in and encourage public and private participation in preserving, restoring and reconstructing the historic colonial resources within the City of St. Augustine that embody that city's significant place in American history. I am also the director of the

City of St. Augustine's Department of Heritage Tourism, which administers St. Augustine's visitor services program and manages a museum that interprets the city's colonial history.

I am here today to urge the Subcommittee to act favorably upon House bill 2457, which authorizes funds to develop an educational center for the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument located in St. Augustine.

In concert with the City of St. Augustine, the Foundation has identified the development of the proposed educational and orientation center for the Castillo as a first priority in the restoration of the colonial resources of the City.

The visitor to the Castillo de San Marcos enters totally unprepared, leaving all but the very well educated unable either to understand its place in history or to fully enjoy the experience. The lessons about the past that this historic site, like any other great piece of history, ought to impart are, I strongly suspect, lost upon most. Few historic sites managed by the National Park Service or, for that matter, any State or local agency that administers them labor under such a disadvantage. No illustrations, no film, no lectures of any kind prepare the visitor.

Especially disadvantaged are the schoolchildren, some 75,000 of whom arrive annually on sponsored visits, and the disabled, who cannot gain access to the terreplain or upper level of the Castillo because its features prohibit construction or access ways to them.

The Castillo itself and the grounds surrounding it contain no space upon which to erect a center for orienting visitors. For that matter, the City and the Foundation selected—for that purpose, the City and the Foundation selected two obvious, well-situated and privately owned parcels adjacent to both the Castillo and the interpretive museum that is administered by the City. The City has already purchased one of those sites. The Foundation has secured from the owner of another an agreement for sale. The City has also undertaken to secure the cooperation of the State of Florida, the owner of the surrounding lots, in this project.

This effort to develop a visitors center for the Castillo is, accordingly, a partnership in every sense, for it will involve Federal, State and municipal governments along with the private sector, represented by the Foundation and the people who contribute to it. All will share in the cost of the center's development. The State of Florida and the City will contribute land to the project. The Foundation and the Federal Government will contribute the moneys for its construction. The City will bear the cost of managing the facility in future years, a not inconsiderable sum given the many millions of people who will enter in that time. The National Park Service will contribute only staffing to conduct visitor orientation.

The siting and construction of the center will also contribute to the continuing restoration program through the removal of intrusive buildings and the replacement by buildings that in scale and appearance harmonize with the adjacent presidio museum.

The opportunity and the participants for this important project are in place at this time. We are thankful to the Congressman for introducing this measure, and we urge your support. Thank you, sir.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you very much, Mr. Adams.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Adams follows:]

**Statement of William R. Adams, Ph.D., Vice President,
Colonial St. Augustine Preservation Foundation, Inc., on H.R. 2457**

My name is William R. Adams. I am appearing before the Subcommittee on behalf of the Colonial St. Augustine Preservation Foundation, Inc., a not-for-profit organization whose purpose is to engage in and encourage public and private participation in preserving, restoring, and reconstructing the historic colonial resources within the City of St. Augustine that embody that city's significant place in American history. I am also the director of the City of St. Augustine's Department of Heritage Tourism, which administers St. Augustine's visitor services program and manages a museum that interprets the city's colonial history.

The reason for my testimony today is to urge the Subcommittee to act favorably upon H.R. 2457, which authorizes funds to develop an educational center for the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, located in St. Augustine. Before addressing the specifics of the proposed educational and orientation center, I would like to provide some historical background that might explain the need for the facility.

The significance of St. Augustine to the history of the United States is manifest. Its historical resources incomparably testify to the contributions of Spain and Spanish-speaking people to the historical and cultural development of the United States. For over two centuries, St. Augustine served as the capital of the Spanish empire in this part of the continent and for most of that time constituted virtually the only population center in the vast southern region stretching from the Atlantic coast to the Mississippi River. The enormity of St. Augustine's contributions to the architectural and cultural heritage of America can hardly be weighed.

Throughout the last century and a half of St. Augustine's 256-years long colonial era, the Castillo de San Marcos was the northern-most military outpost within Spain's enormous New World empire. It is the oldest masonry fort and the best preserved example of Spanish colonial fortification in the continental United States. Begun in 1672 and substantially completed by 1695, the Castillo subsequently enabled the Spanish to withstand two attempts by the English to drive them from St. Augustine and Florida.

The War Department assumed control of the Castillo in 1821 when the United States took possession of Spain's Florida colonies. The venerable fortress was transferred to the National Park Service in 1936. Since that time, it has been the central historical attraction within St. Augustine, with an average annual visitation of more than a half million.

The Foundation that I represent here today has picked up the reins of a seven-decade long program to restore the northern section of the colonial presidio of St. Augustine, adjacent to the Castillo. That Restoration program, initiated in 1936 upon the recommendation of a national committee of citizens, public officials and scholars, was originally directed by a former chief historian and acting director of the Branch of Historic Sites and Buildings for the National Park Service, Dr. Verne Chatelain.

From 1959 to 1997, the State of Florida administered the Restoration program. Upon the state's withdrawal, the City of St. Augustine, numbering only some 12,000 inhabitants, took responsibility for carrying on a project that is of inestimable importance to the interpretation of American colonial history. The Colonial St. Augustine Preservation Foundation was formed to mobilize the support of private citizens to assist the City in preserving and interpreting for its visitors St. Augustine's colonial legacy. In concert with the City of St. Augustine, the Foundation has identified the development of the proposed educational and orientation center for the Castillo as a first priority.

The visitor to the Castillo de San Marcos enters the site coldly unprepared, leaving all but the very well educated unable either to understand its place in history or fully enjoy the experience. The lessons about the past that this historic site, like any other great piece of history, ought to impart are, I strongly suspect, lost upon most. Few historic sites managed by the National Park Service or, for that matter, any state and local agencies that administer them, labor under such a disadvantage. No illustrations, no film, no lectures of any kind prepare the visitor.

Especially disadvantaged by the lack of an orientation center are school children, some 75,000 of whom arrive annually on sponsored visits; and the disabled, who cannot gain access to the terreplain or upper level of the Castillo because its features prohibit construction of access-ways for them.

The Castillo itself and the grounds surrounding it contain no space upon which to erect a center for orienting visitors. For that purpose, the City and the Founda-

tion selected two obvious, well situated and privately owned parcels adjacent to both the Castillo and the interpretive museum that is administered by the City. The City has already purchased one of those sites. The Foundation has secured from the owner of another an agreement for sale. The City has also undertaken to secure the cooperation of the State of Florida, the owner of the surrounding lots, in this project.

This effort to develop a visitor's center for the Castillo is accordingly a partnership in every sense, for it will involve Federal, state and municipal governments along with the private sector, represented by the Foundation and the people who contribute to it. All will share in the cost of the center's development. The State of Florida and the City of St. Augustine will contribute land to the project; the Foundation and the Federal Government will contribute the monies for its construction. The City will bear the cost of managing the facility in future years, a not inconsiderable sum given the many millions of people who will enter in that time. The National Park Service will contribute staffing to conduct visitor orientation.

The siting and construction of the center will also contribute to the continuing Restoration program through the removal of intrusive buildings and their replacement by buildings that in scale and appearance harmonize with the adjacent presidio museum. Our foundation is committed to this project and we respectfully urge your support.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Jarvis, I know you have got 5 minutes to talk about three bills, and we just got another vote call. Why don't you take some time to explain these bills, and then we will break. We still have about another 10 minutes. If you would like to begin.

STATEMENT OF JON JARVIS, REGIONAL DIRECTOR, PACIFIC WEST REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA (H.R. 546, H.R. 2457 AND H.R. 2715)

Mr. JARVIS. I will go through them very quickly then.

First, I will speak to the Kaloko-Honokohau bill.

By the way, I am Jon Jarvis, Regional Director of the Pacific West Region. We have submitted our testimony for the record and thank you for the opportunity.

The first bill, H.R. 546, the boundary adjustment to Kaloko-Honokohau, would add two parcels. We support that. The Department supports that bill. It will save the National Park Service approximately \$150,000 per year in lease costs that we are currently paying.

This facility will serve four parks on the Island of Hawaii. It is an existing building that is currently not being used and will be an excellent facility both for the visitors, administration and particularly for the collection and storage of the cultural items for the native culture.

So, with that, that is all I have to say about that bill.

Mr. RADANOVICH. That is great.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Jarvis follows:]

Statement of Jon Jarvis, Regional Director, Pacific West Region, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, on H.R. 546

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 546, a bill to revise the boundary of the Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park in the State of Hawaii.

The Department supports the enactment of H.R. 546, which is virtually identical to S. 254 as passed by the Senate on March 3, 2003. This legislation would adjust the boundary of the Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park to include two adjacent parcels of land, totaling 2.14 acres, to be used as the park headquarters to house administrative, interpretive, resource management, and maintenance functions. No appraisal has been done of these properties, but both parcels and the building were assessed for a total of \$2.0 million, according to Hawaii County public

records. Purchasing this property would allow the National Park Service to relinquish its existing lease, which costs \$150,000 per year. Over the long term, this acquisition would prove more cost-effective than continuing the lease, even when adding in estimated annual maintenance costs of \$24,000-\$48,000.

Since 1988, the park has leased building space outside the park boundary to carry out needed administrative, interpretive, resource management and maintenance functions. These leased spaces have also been providing the basic means of visitor contact for park information and orientation. The amount of visitor parking available at this leased facility is completely inadequate (limited to 3 to 4 spaces).

The two parcels are adjacent to the existing park boundary though separated from the park by a state highway right-of-way. More than 90 percent of the land remains undeveloped and is large enough to accommodate the storage of park vehicles and equipment as well as visitor and staff parking. One of the parcels contains a 6,039 square-foot, two-story concrete block building that would permit an easy and inexpensive retrofit for use as the park headquarters. The building has never been occupied and contains offices, restrooms, a reception lobby, lab, storage areas, and a garage with roll-up trucking access doors and a loading dock. The entire side of the building facing the park consists of glass block walls from which sweeping panoramic views of the park, including the ocean, can be seen. The building interior is air conditioned and finished with floor tile and carpeting.

The location of the property between the Kona International Airport and the City of Kailua-Kona would be highly accessible to visitors to the Kona Coast and would be an invaluable asset for all of the National Park Service units on the Island of Hawaii. It could support the co-location of a number of management functions for Pu'uhonua o Honaunau National Historical Park, Pu'ukohola Heiau National Historic Site, and would also house the offices of the Ala Kahakai National Historic Trail.

Established in 1978, the purpose of Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park is to provide a site for the preservation, interpretation and perpetuation of traditional native Hawaiian culture and activities, and to demonstrate historic land use patterns. An important management goal at the park is to limit the development of facilities within the park to those directly related to visitor services. The acquisition of the properties that would be brought into the boundary by H.R. 546 would allow for facilities related to park operations, including administration, resource management and maintenance, to be permanently sited in a location that would not impact park values and resources. In that respect, the boundary adjustment would be consistent with National Park Service Management Policies that states "the Service must avoid the construction of buildings, roads, and other developments that will cause unacceptable impacts on park resources and values."

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my prepared remarks and I will be happy to answer any questions you or other committee members might have.

Mr. JARVIS. The second bill that I will speak to is H.R. 2457.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to speak to this regarding the authorization of funds for an education center at the Castillo de San Marcos in Florida.

The Department of Interior strongly supports the concept of a partnership with the City and the Foundation. The need for a visitors' center was identified in the draft management plan which was prepared in 1977, and they identified not only the need for a visitor center but also the opportunity to do it jointly with partners.

I would mention that plan is 25 years old, and the park has begun a new general management plan, just started this last year. We have public meetings planned for this fall and a public draft due out in the spring of 2004. This new GMP gives us the opportunity to flesh out the details of a partnership arrangement and how the National Park Service would most effectively participate with the Foundation and the City of St. Augustine; and, therefore, we would ask—the Department asks that they defer on H.R. 2457 until we complete the GMP, which would be next year, and also because of our emphasis this year on eliminating the maintenance backlog in the National Park System.

And that concludes my testimony on that bill. Shall I keep rolling?

Mr. RADANOVICH. Absolutely.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Jarvis follows:]

**Statement of Jon Jarvis, Regional Director, Pacific West Region,
National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, on H.R. 2457**

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department's views on H.R. 2457. This bill would authorize funds for an educational center for the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument.

The Department supports the concept of a cooperatively constructed and operated educational center for the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument (Monument) and the City of St. Augustine, Florida as outlined in H.R. 2457. However, because the National Park Service (NPS) is in the process of completing a General Management Plan (GMP) which will include an examination of the long-identified need for a Visitor Center at the Monument, we believe this legislation is premature and that the GMP process should be finalized before moving such a proposal. Additionally, in order to help us make further progress on the President's Initiative to eliminate the deferred maintenance backlog, we recommend that the Subcommittee defer action on H.R. 2457 during the 108th Congress.

H.R. 2457 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) to award grants to the City of St. Augustine and the Colonial St. Augustine Preservation Foundation (Foundation) for land acquisition, planning, design, and construction of an educational center for the Monument and attractions located within the City. The grants will not be awarded until the City and Foundation have secured contributions for a dollar-for-dollar match of the grant. Prior to awarding a grant authorized under this bill, the Secretary is directed to enter into a cooperative agreement with the City and Foundation for the planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance of the educational center. This agreement will allow all the parties to determine—before the new facility is built—what are the full life-cycle costs to operate and maintain the center, and how these costs will be shared.

The Federal portion of the grants proposed by H.R. 2457 would be \$2 million for land acquisition, design, and planning, and an additional \$2 million for construction. The Foundation has developed a conceptual design, as well as preliminary cost estimates for the educational center, which would be approximately 9,000 square feet in size and cost approximately \$3 million. If constructed, NPS operational costs are expected to be minimal as one of the primary purposes of the educational center would be to provide a sales outlet for joint tickets to the Monument and City attractions. These ticket sales are expected to generate enough additional revenue to cover all operational costs of the educational center. If revenues from ticket sales do not cover all operational and maintenance costs, then the cooperative agreement will specify how the unfunded costs will be shared among NPS, the City, and the Foundation.

The Castillo de San Marcos National Monument was originally proclaimed as Fort Marion National Monument, under the jurisdiction of the War Department, in 1924. The Monument was transferred to NPS in 1933 and renamed in 1942 and is located in St. Augustine, Florida, the oldest continuously occupied European settlement in the Continental United States. The Spanish, who controlled Florida for 225 years before it became a United States territory, constructed the Castillo de San Marcos, the oldest masonry fort in the Continental United States.

The Monument has never had a visitor center and has relied upon exhibits within the fort to provide visitor orientation and information even though it receives approximately 700,000 visitors each year. The need for a jointly developed and operated visitor center for the Monument and other local attractions was identified in the Monument's 1977 Draft Master Plan. Currently, the Monument is developing a General Management Plan to replace this almost 30-year-old management document and initial scoping for the plan has also identified the need for this type of visitor center. In a public forum and process, the General Management Plan will seek to confirm the purpose, function, and scope of the proposed visitor center. Both of these plans encourage better cooperation between the NPS and the agency that interprets the civilian life of the Spanish soldier within the local community.

The educational center proposed in H.R. 2457 would serve the Monument, where the military story of the Spanish soldier's life is interpreted as well as the Colonial Spanish Quarter Museum operated by the City, where the civilian life of the soldier is interpreted. The City has operated the Spanish Quarter Museum since 1997 after being operated by the State of Florida since the mid 1960s.

The overall project would consist of two phases with the first phase consisting of land acquisition and facility planning and design and the second phase being facility construction. The bill also could allow the value of the land to be used as part of an in-kind match for the City and Foundation's match of the Federal grant, if the land is donated to the Secretary. Although our understanding is that the intent is for the educational center to remain on City property and be City owned, should this donation occur, legislation would be required to expand the Monument's boundary around the proposed site of the educational center, which is adjacent to, but outside of, the current boundary.

That completes my testimony. I would be happy to answer any questions that you or any members of the Subcommittee may have.

Mr. JARVIS. The third bill that I would like to testify to today is H.R. 2715. Since we have limited time at this moment, I will like to invite the Superintendent of Yosemite, Mike Tollefson, to the table, but I would like to do that afterwards.

Mr. RADANOVICH. If we can hear your testimony, Mr. Jarvis, and then recess and come back and then Mr. Tollefson can join you then for questions.

Mr. JARVIS. We greatly appreciate the Subcommittee's support and leadership in this area of working with gateway communities. We look forward to working with you not only in this bill but also in future bills that relate to gateway communities.

The Department strongly supports section 1 which would allow the National Park Service to participate actively in the future of the Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System, or YARTS. This has been a goal since the 1980 general management plan to participate in a regional transportation system. So we do support that section.

We are concerned about one aspect of that, and that is the identification of user fees as one funding source. We feel that this has departmental, if not broader, implications for recreation fees, and we suggest that discussions of how those fees—recreation service wide if not departmental wide—be addressed in the future on field legislation.

Section 2 regarding camping in the Upper and Lower Rivers, these proposals are not consistent with the 1980 general management plan, which has been modified by the Yosemite Valley Plan and the Merced River Plan. These plans have had many years of public comment and strike a balance between day use and camping. However, we would like to work with you further on this issue.

Section 2 also calls for authorization of specific benefits to concession employees, and the Department does not believe that it is appropriate for the Federal Government to provide these kinds of subsidies to concession employees.

Section 2 also would prohibit the use of funds for remote parking. We want to emphasize there are no plans to prohibit private automobiles in the Valley at any time. All we are trying to do is create transportation choices, and any remote parking would be 10 or more years away. But, again, we would like to work with you on those concerns.

Section 2 also calls for the removal of the LeConte Memorial Lodge. The LeConte is one of four National Historic Landmarks, including the Ahwahnee, the Parsons Lodge and the Rangers Club; and the Department is opposed to removing this structure. Again,

though, we would be happy to work with you on any concerns you have over its use.

And that concludes my testimony.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Jarvis.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Jarvis follows:]

**Statement of Jon Jarvis, Regional Director, Pacific West Region,
National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, on H.R. 2715**

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 2715, a bill to provide for necessary improvements to facilities at Yosemite National Park.

The Department strongly supports enhancing partnerships and increasing communication between gateway communities and Yosemite National Park. These efforts are consistent with the Administration's "new environmentalism," an initiative that will help build a healthier environment, dynamic economies, and sustainable communities. At the center of the Department's plan to implement this new environmentalism are what Secretary Norton has termed the "Four C's"—Communication, Consultation, and Cooperation, all in the service of Conservation. The Four C's recognize that both gateway communities and Federal lands can benefit from creative partnerships.

Last Congress, the Department voiced strong support for improving partnerships and enhancing cooperation with gateway communities that border all Federal lands when we testified on H.R. 4622, the "Gateway Communities Cooperation Act of 2002". We appreciate the Subcommittee's leadership on this issue, and we look forward to continuing to work with you on these efforts.

The Department strongly supports section 1 of H.R. 2715, with one exception identified in later in this testimony. Section 1 would authorize the use of donated funds, funds collected from user fees, or appropriated funds to pay for construction of facilities outside the boundaries of the park that serve Yosemite and its visitors. This provision, which is similar to authority that has existed since 1996 for Zion National Park, would facilitate the development of the Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System (YARTS) by allowing the National Park Service to help pay for the costs of YARTS facilities outside the park.

The development of a regional transportation system for Yosemite and its gateway communities as a means of providing transportation choices to the park for visitors and employees has been a goal of the Department since the adoption of the park's General Management Plan in 1980. In 1999, Mariposa, Merced, and Mono counties created a Joint Powers Authority as an entity to implement YARTS and entered into a cooperative agreement with Yosemite National Park. Now in its fourth successful year, YARTS provides excellent service and connections to broader transportation systems such as Amtrak. Visitor usage of YARTS has increased by about 20 percent in each of the last two years. Although ridership and revenues are increasing, in order to become fully functional, YARTS is still in need of strong support to help it expand and provide quality service. The authority provided by section 1 would allow the National Park Service to provide a financial contribution to the expansion of YARTS.

While we support section 1, we are concerned about authorizing the use of "user fees," as one of the funding sources for activities under this bill. We note that Chairman Pombo has committed to working on the authorization of the recreation fee program and has expressed support for using recreation fees to increase the enjoyment of the recreational experience on Federal lands. Determining how recreation fee money is spent to enhance visitor facilities and services is an important element of the recreation fee program for all participating agencies. While we recognize that creative and mutually-beneficial opportunities exist to link gateway communities with the recreation fee program, we suggest that the issue of whether activities authorized by H.R. 2715 are an appropriate use for recreation fees be addressed during upcoming discussions on recreation fee legislation.

Section 2 of H.R. 2715 requires the Secretary to allocate funds identified in section 1 for a number of planning, transportation, and visitor service purposes. This section would require funding to be used for planning and restoration of low-impact camping at upper and lower river campgrounds. This is not included in the park's 1980 General Management Plan as amended by the Yosemite Valley Plan and the Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan. These plans were developed over many years with extensive public involvement and comment. We believe the General Management Plan strikes a balance between the recreational demands of day-users and campers visiting the park. However, we recognize

Congress's authority to move forward on this issue and, if that occurs, we ask for the opportunity to work with the Subcommittee further on this issue.

Section 2 would authorize activities, some of which are already allowed for under existing law relating to parking, traffic management, and housing and transportation for park employees. This section also would require the Secretary to provide housing and transportation benefits for employees of concessioners. Such benefits are not currently provided to these employees. The Department does not believe that it is appropriate for the Federal Government to provide concession employees with these types of benefits.

In addition, section 2 would require funds be used to remove the LeConte Memorial Lodge in Yosemite. Built in 1903 and moved to its present location in 1918, the LeConte Memorial Lodge is one of four structures in the park designated as a National Historic Landmark, along with the Ahwahnee Hotel, Parsons Memorial Lodge, and the Rangers Club. Since this is a designated National Historic Landmark, the Department is opposed to removing this structure. We would be happy to discuss any concerns you may have about its use.

We are unsure of the intent of the provision in section 2 that would prohibit the use of funds made available under this legislation to implement a shuttle system that uses remote parking facilities or includes operations outside the boundaries of Yosemite Valley. We do want the Subcommittee to be aware that there are no plans to prohibit private automobiles from entering and being used in Yosemite National Park. Instead, long-range proposals in the Yosemite Valley Plan look toward supplemental transportation choices through shuttle or bus systems to accommodate and better manage projected increases in visitation and to provide better connections to gateway communities. Most of these plans, including the development of remote parking facilities outside the valley, are at least 10 or more years away. We would like to work with the Subcommittee to address our concerns with this section.

The National Park Service is putting a great deal of resources into improving the visitor experience, planning for growth of visitation, and increasing camping and day-use opportunities for the millions who visit Yosemite annually. We are also striving to better protect and enhance Yosemite's world-class natural and cultural resources, and to coordinate even more closely with our gateway partners to provide for better communities and a better Yosemite.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement. We look forward to working with the Subcommittee as the Department has an opportunity to review the bill further. I would be happy to answer any questions you or other members of the Subcommittee may have.

Mr. RADANOVICH. We are under the voting—apparently, the gentleman from Vermont is not happy with a few things, so he is calling a lot of procedural votes right now, so we have to recess briefly. It will only be one vote, so the recess will be very short, and we will join you shortly.

[Recess.]

Mr. RADANOVICH. We are back in session, and hopefully there won't be any more votes. I am going to ask you a question, Mr. Adams, regarding H.R. 2457.

There are several entities working together on this project—the State of Florida, City of St. Augustine, the Colonial St. Augustine Preservation Foundation and the National Park Service. Can you give us an overview please of these organizations and how they will work together and the role that each will serve in carrying out this project?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir. The City of St. Augustine maintains a museum across the—adjacent to the Castillo de San Marcos that interprets the civilian side of the colonial experience. The National Park Service at the Castillo interprets the military side. So we would anticipate that there would be a joint operation of the center by the City and the Castillo in offering these services to visitors.

The funds for the purchase of the property and for the development of the building would be provided by this legislation and by

the Colonial St. Augustine preservation Foundation. The City of St. Augustine and the State of Florida will contribute the land for the project. The center then that results would be, in our current planning, current thinking, would be Title II to the City of St. Augustine and would be under lease to the Park Service or a permit to the Park Service to conduct just visitor orientation services within the building. So that, consequently, we do not anticipate that the Park Service would have any expense in future years in the maintenance or operation of the building itself.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you very much.

Mr. Jarvis, a couple of questions on H.R. 2715, the Yosemite bill. While I definitely do appreciate the administration's support for my efforts to enhance an increased communication between the gateway communities and Yosemite National Park, I am a little perplexed as to why the service remains steadfast against any efforts to restore some of the basic low-impact campsites to the Upper and Lower River campground areas.

After all, what would be the harm, especially noting that the campsites would be placed within a 150-foot setback from the river? Does the Bush administration place restoration of a riverbank above providing a basic recreation opportunity? And would you agree that low-impact campsites are good use of an area located within the flood plain which Upper and Lower River campgrounds are?

Please feel free to bring Mike Tollefson, who, of course, is Superintendent, up to table as well. Mr. Jarvis, I know that you asked previously to do that; and I want to welcome Mike to the Subcommittee hearing.

Mr. JARVIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

We feel—the Department feels that the plans that have been worked out with the public over the last—well, almost 20 plus years and most intensely over the last few years are all integrally linked. They all strive to strike the appropriate balance between the needs of camping and day use, and they all begin with the basis of the Merced River plan which zones a protection area along the river and identifies appropriate recreational uses that really does, I believe and the National Park Service believes, an elegant job in distributing the public throughout the Valley and enhancing their experiences. The—and there is a lot invested here with the lineup of projects to implement this over the next 5, 10 years.

So it is our feeling that it strikes the appropriate balance without the restoration or without the reconstruction of these campsites. We feel there are other places in Yosemite where campsites can be added without opening up the whole planning effort again and creating the controversy that Yosemite tends to generate.

Mr. RADANOVICH. It is noted that since the flood of 1997 the Upper and Lower River campgrounds have been shut down, and the idea in the plan is to dedicate that land primarily to habitat restoration. I think it has been said there has been a lot of activity in that area since the enclosure of the campgrounds anyway. Is it in your mind going to be tough if this area is dedicated to habitat restoration? It is going to be hard to keep people out of that area anyway, isn't it?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, the plan calls also for day use. One of the things we have been focused on is to begin a day use plan in that area, and there are some areas in there—there are three great beaches that are seeing an increase in day use. As we speak today, I am sure people are frolicking on the beach after river rafting down the river. So there are several areas that have been clearly identified that we could allow a significant amount of day use that would relieve pressure from other areas in the Valley.

Mr. RADANOVICH. So there is going to be a human footprint, I think, on the restoration area anyway.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Jarvis, you mentioned the administration's opposition to removing the LeConte Memorial because it has been designated a National Historic Landmark. Would you not agree that the landmark status refers to the building itself and not to the land that it is currently sitting on?

Mr. JARVIS. That is correct. It does refer to the architectural design of the building and its setting.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Isn't it true that the building has been moved once already?

Mr. JARVIS. Yes.

Mr. RADANOVICH. You mention in your testimony, Mr. Jarvis, that the Service currently has no plans to prohibit automobiles from entering and being used in the park, but in the long term you are developing supplemental transportation choices. My immediate concern is not that this administration has plans to remove the family minivan from enjoying a day in Yosemite, or any car for that matter, but future administrations. Why not prevent the elimination of choices now before they are eliminated in the future?

Mr. JARVIS. The National Park Service prides itself, I believe, in being a leader in transportation. Many of our parks in the system are experiencing not an overuse of the public but congestion as a result of the private automobile. We believe that providing the public a range of options to visit the park, particularly the transportation systems that are high quality, have interpretive opportunities, have looped trips can enhance the public's experience and Yosemite, is a perfect example of that as well.

There are many things to be done, though, in the Valley in the next 10 years as we implement these plans that will change the way the Valley is being used and redistribute the public. So any plans for remote parking are in the outyears. So we felt it is not the time to limit those opportunities.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Would you address, please, the issue of what I call special access that the Sierra Club has to the LeConte Memorial? I know there are some public activities that take place there. But the fact of the matter is that Sierra Club members have a special access into the park, kind of a special place to park, special place of their own. Don't you call that special access and isn't that kind of over and above what should be allowed when we are looking at cutting back the number of campsites and such in the Valley.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Sierra Club manages LeConte and has since it was built as a memorial to John Muir and named after Dr. LeConte who passed away in the park. The programs that they put

on—the predominant programs are public programs that they invite public to, and they are not advocacy programs. They are nature walks, that kind of program. I don't believe there is any special parking there for them, maybe other than one person, as I reflect on that, being so fairly new. There is no special parking in that location. Other organizations such as Yosemite Institute and Yosemite Association also use that facility for public programs.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you.

One last question. Yosemite Valley plan calls for reducing day use parking to about 550 spaces, I believe. In my bill I am suggesting as many as 1,200 spaces. Does the Service believe that by reducing the number of spaces of day use parking that it will also reduce the number of day use visitors to the park?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. No, sir. The reduction in day use parking from the number of approximately 1,200 that we are using as today's current use level, reducing the parking is tied to providing a shuttle from outside of—west of the Valley, if you will, into the Valley in anticipation of an increase in the number of day use visitors.

At 1,200 sites, we can accommodate the flow we have today, plus or minus 4 million visitors. But as the numbers increase, we are going to need to provide a different way to get them into the Valley, and it provides a better experience. Once they are there today and park their cars, almost 2.8 million people ride the existing shuttle system in the Valley.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Separate shuttle system.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RADANOVICH. All right. I think those are the extent of my questions.

I know Mr. Mica was not able to make it back, and he did have one question, and I am going to ask it of Dr. Adams—to you, Mr. Adams. I know Mr. Mica wanted to know how is the project that is being proposed, how is it unique from many of the other requests that this Committee receives?

Mr. ADAMS. Well, I am not familiar with the other requests that this Committee receives, but I would suggest that one of the things that is unique about this is the partnership that is involved. We have brought all the players in—St. Augustine, Federal, State and local governments and the private citizens as well—into this project; and it will result in one that will be also cooperatively administered and managed by the City and the National Park Service.

Mr. RADANOVICH. All right, gentlemen. Thank you. I think that is the extent of my questions. I appreciate you being here.

Mr. Tollefson, Mr. Jarvis, thank you for coming out for this; and Mr. Adams, thank you, too.

This ends the hearing.

[Whereupon, at 3 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]